

**From:** [ANDERSON Jim M](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [MCCLINCY Matt](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Reviewing RD2 SCSR  
**Date:** 02/13/2007 08:20 AM

---

Eric,  
Yeah, I think your idea is good. Please give me a call early this afternoon & we'll discuss. I'll be happy to try to help you organize the review plan

James M. Anderson  
DEQ Northwest Region  
Portland Harbor Section  
Phone (503) 229-6825  
Fax (503) 229-6899

-----Original Message-----

From: [Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov)  
[mailto:[Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov)]  
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2007 5:28 PM  
To: ANDERSON Jim M  
Cc: [Humphrey.Chip@epa.gov](mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epa.gov); [MCCLINCY Matt](#)  
Subject: Re: Reviewing RD2 SCSR

Jim, thanks for taking a first cut at this. While I think your breakdown looks good, I think we also need to realize that this report will not be a section by section review. In addition to the sections outlined in your email, we have a number of appendices. Given the size of the report (6 volumes plus a map folio) we will not be able to go through the report on a page by page basis. As I stated at the retreat, I view the report as a resource that we will consult to allow us to 1) Understand the data we have and 2) Identify the data we need to help us make a risk based decision about site cleanup.

I am wondering if we can look at the report from a data gap perspective. For example:

First, we identify a key list of potential data gaps - building off the Round 3 Data Gaps memo and SOW we prepared earlier and supplemented by further thinking over the past year and at the retreat. Second, we identify core groups responsible for looking at the data gaps. Third, we identify those areas of the report as well as our own tools that will help us understand the data we have for each potential data gap. Fourth, we look at each potential data gap in the context of existing data and what is needed to make a cleanup decision. Fifth, we group these data gaps by media to facilitate the development of FSPs.

I need to think about this a little further. I will begin going through the key data gaps and linking them up to sections of the report and the appendices. Are you available to discuss tomorrow sometime?

Eric

ANDERSON Jim M  
<[ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us](mailto:ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us)>

02/12/2007 08:46 AM

To  
[Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#),  
[Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
Cc  
[MCCLINCY Matt](#)  
<[MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us](mailto:MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us)>  
Subject  
Reviewing RD2 SCSR

Eric & Chip,  
At the end of the RD2 Data Retreat, we said we'd develop a strategy for reviewing the report & share it during our 2/14 TCT mtg. I looked at report outline (Val O's 1/19/07 e-mail) & re-looked at EPA's 12/2/05 "Identification of RD3 Data Gaps" letter & EPA's 2/17/06 "RD 3 Scope of Work" letter.

As you guys said, we'll need to be smart about this review. We'll need to focus on identifying data gaps. Since hardly anyone will be able to review the entire report (except maybe you 2..., good luck with that one), we should also consider dividing the report & assign sections or tasks to individuals.

I like the way EPA/partners have broken in to work groups in the past.  
I suggest we consider re-forming those work groups for the RD2 SCSR  
review as follows:

Physical/N&E WG- EPA (Rene, Curt, Kristine, PMX, Eric, & Chip), DEQ  
(Jim, Matt, & Tom G), Partners (Tribes & NOAA) Eco Risk Assessors- EPA  
(Burt, Joe, Eric & PMX), DEQ (Jennifer), Partners (Tribes, Jeremy, NOAA)  
HH Risk Assessors- EPA (Dana, Eric, & PMX), DEQ (Mike P), partners  
(Tribes & NOAA)

I suggest we consider breaking the RD2 SCSR review into the following  
assignments:

- 1.0 Introduction- Quick review by everyone
- 2.0 Sources of Environmental Data- Quick review by PMX &/or Gina
- 3.0 CSM Summary- Quick review by everyone
- 4.0 Physical Setting- Quick reviews by:
  - 4.1 Land Use- Physical/N&E WG & SC staff (Jim, Matt,  
Kristine)
  - 4.2 Hydrogeology- Physical/N&E WG
  - 4.3 Hydrology- Physical/N&E WG
  - 4.4 Riverbed Characteristics & Sediment Dynamics-  
Physical/N&E WG & EPA hydro modelers
  - 4.5 Sediment Transport Regimes- Physical/N&E WG & EPA  
hydro modelers
  - 4.6 Habitat- Eco Risk Assessors
  - 4.7 Human Access & Use- HH Risk Assessors
- 5.0 Identification of Sources- Physical/N&E WG
- 6.0 In-River Chemical Distribution- Quick review by everyone
- 7.0 Overview & Approach to Assessment of Loading, Fate, &  
Transport Processes- Physical/N&E WG & EPA hydro modelers
- 8.0 Initial HH Risk Evaluation Summary- HH Risk Assessors
- 9.0 Initial Eco Risk Evaluation Summary- Eco Risk Assessors
- 10.0 Preliminary Identification of iAOPCs- Everyone
- 11.0 CSM- Everyone
- 12.0 Data Gaps & Additional Data Needs- Everyone

I think we also need to see how well the RD2 SCSR addresses issues  
contained in EPA's 12/2/05 & 2/17/06 letters. Here's my suggestion for  
that task:

Does the RD2 SCSR or the RD 3A work address the data gaps EPA identified  
in their 12/2/05 letter? Mainly EPA/PMX, with support by appropriate WGs

Does the RD2 SCSR or the RD 3A work address the data needs EPA  
identified in their 2/17/06 letter? Mainly EPA/PMX, with support by  
appropriate WGs

I also think it would be worthwhile for someone (PMX) to go thru EPA's 2  
letter & summarize the data gaps & SOW in concise tables to help us  
manage this effort. I'd like to see this summary several days before  
2/21 so we have a chance to review & understand.

This is all just a suggestion to start the ball rolling.

James M. Anderson  
DEQ Northwest Region  
Portland Harbor Section  
Phone (503) 229-6825  
Fax (503) 229-6899